

THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: PAROCHIAL OR COSMOPOLITAN? REFLECTIONS ON THE INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN SOCIOLOGY

by Bryce Wood and Charles Wagley

THE social sciences may be culture-bound in some rather confusing ways. Appreciation of this possibility is enhanced as intellectual contacts increase among scholars from different countries. An Argentine economist has claimed, for example, that the economics taught in the United States and Great Britain in the 1940's was not relevant to Latin America because problems of economic development were ignored and questions of equilibrium were overemphasized. And a Chilean sociologist has stated: "Some sociologists in North America seem to think that a society that is changing is destroying itself, but we consider that *unless* our societies are in process of change, they are destroying themselves."

Implications of these opinions were among questions considered at the Inter-American Conference on Research and Training in Sociology, which was held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, on August 25-27, 1961, under the auspices of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies,¹ with the aid of a grant from the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics.²

¹ The members of the committee, which is jointly sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, are Robert N. Burr, University of California, Los Angeles (chairman); Henry P. de Vries, Columbia University; Fred P. Ellison, University of Texas; Wendell Gordon, University of Texas; Stanley J. Stein, Princeton University; Charles Wagley, Columbia University; Robert Wauchope, Tulane University; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

² The participants in the conference were: Guillermo Briones, Instituto de Sociología, Universidad de Chile; John A. Clausen, University

The general purpose of the conference was to contribute, through personal acquaintance and scholarly interchange, to the improvement of communication among sociologists in the Americas. The sessions were informal and no papers were presented, although several participants made introductory comments on the principal subjects of discussion. These included the development of the discipline of sociology in Latin America and the United States; training and careers in sociology; development of sociological research; and scholarly exchanges and communication. By agreement in advance no explicit consensus was to be reached at the conference, and no recommendations were to be made. The present summary of interpretations and suggestions offered at the sessions has been prepared by two participants,

of California, Berkeley; L. A. Costa Pinto, Faculdade Nacional de Ciências Econômicas and Faculdade Nacional de Filosofia, Universidade do Brasil; Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University; Orlando Fals Borda, Facultad de Sociología, Universidad Nacional de Colombia; Gino Germani, Departamento de Sociología, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires; Peter Heintz, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Santiago, Chile; Rex D. Hopper, Brooklyn College; Wilburg Jiménez Castro, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad de Costa Rica; Joseph A. Kahl, Washington University; Thomas Ktsanes, Tulane University; Seymour M. Lipset, University of California, Berkeley; Wilbert E. Moore, Princeton University; H. M. Phillips, Department of Social Sciences, UNESCO; José Arthur Rios, Departamento de Pesquisas, Economia e Humanismo, Rio de Janeiro; Elbridge Sibley, Social Science Research Council; T. Lynn Smith, University of Florida; William C. Spencer, Institute of International Education; J. M. Stykos, Cornell University; Charles Wagley, Columbia University; Bryce Wood, Social Science Research Council; and Donald Young, Russell Sage Foundation.

neither of whom is a sociologist. We draw our statements from the conference discussion, but the views are our own unless attributed to others.

CONTRASTING DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AS A DISCIPLINE

Sociology was introduced as a subject of instruction in universities in the 1890's, both in Latin American countries and in the United States, but thereafter the course of growth of the discipline in the two areas differed substantially.

In Latin America the European philosophical and legal tradition remained strong in the shaping of sociology as an academic subject for a much longer time than in the United States. Teachers of sociology, while accepting the idea of the existence of a science of society and the utility of knowledge in bringing about social change, adopted a general approach that included theoretical analyses of social structures, but tended to avoid intensive examination of specific elements of society. The establishment of chairs of sociology in the universities was not followed either by the appearance of professional, full-time sociologists or by the employment of empirical methods in the gathering of data. In general, emphasis was given to the philosophical and literary form of sociological writing, and reliance was placed on wisdom and illustrations, as distinct from the testing of theories and hypotheses through data gained by research. Much was said by early writers in sociology about "social reality" [*realidad social*] but little was done to study it objectively and empirically. Scholars who placed a high value on literary style were not only antipathetic to research in sociology; it would have required investments of time that were not available to teachers, nearly all of whom gave only part of their time and energies to the universities.

In the United States, on the other hand, professorships in sociology were full-time appointments, and departments of sociology were organized in the universities, in contrast to the establishment of only one chair of sociology in each Latin American institution. The discipline in its early stage of growth was marked by the appearance of diverse "schools" of thought and by great interest in social reforms. The "schools," however, have largely disappeared, and sociologists as such are not centrally concerned with social reform movements. They become immersed in quantitative and objective research on social relations and social structure, both for purposes of increasing basic scientific knowledge of human behavior and its application to social problems.

The development of empirical and quantitative research on human behavior is likely to be most extensive

and successful in a relatively homogeneous society in which observers are fairly secure in their knowledge of the basic traits of the various subcultures of the national society. No one would deny the complexity of the United States with its regional differences and variety of cultural traditions deriving from Europe, for these have given sociologists who use quantitative techniques considerable difficulty in framing their questions and interpreting their data. Yet, we think it can be said that at least during the last three decades, the United States has been a more homogeneous and stable society than most Latin American societies. North American "quantifiers" have been more certain they were asking meaningful questions—but not always so. In Latin America the striking economic, social, and cultural contrasts complicate the tasks of empirical research enormously.

Although the national societies of Latin America are essentially European in derivation and in social structure, in large parts of the area the degree of retention of American Indian and African patterns is great compared with the United States. The cultural differences between the literate urban cosmopolitans and the relatively illiterate, rural population often mean that the sociologist must learn a new culture and another language in order to carry on empirical field studies. Even in countries without strong African and Indian traditions, the sociologist, who is probably city-bred and certainly university-trained, must learn the patterns of the small towns, the rural countryside, and the growing urban working class. The task of the sociologist, the generalizer and interpreter of Latin American society, has not been easy, for he has had to formulate qualitatively the basic outlines of the society. This is perhaps why quantitative sociology has developed most rapidly in such countries as Argentina, Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Chile, which are most homogeneous, and why so many excellent qualitative "community studies" have been carried out in the more culturally complex societies of Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, and Brazil, to mention a few.

In addition to these problems, Latin American sociologists have been faced with others not unknown to their North American colleagues. There are many people in Latin America who regard the work of empirical sociological research as a threat to values and social structures they consider vital to the cohesion of Latin American society. There are scholars, even within the sociological profession, who claim that the importation of research techniques and sociological concepts developed within the United States is but another aspect of "Yankee imperialism." One participant in the conference suggested that in these circumstances an individual's decision to become a sociologist—that is, to attempt to attain a rational and scientific knowledge of the

social organization of Latin American societies—is usually a “militant” decision because of the high probability that the publication of findings about such subjects as class structure or changes in control within the family will give rise to religious and political controversies of a serious character.

NEW LATIN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY

Despite such difficulties, there is “new” Latin American sociology. One participant even suggested that the “future of sociology” might be in Latin America. With substantial variations from country to country, there seems to be some evidence of a trend toward greater recognition and utilization of quantitative and empirical research in sociology. There is a growing number of sociologists who desire to make use of advanced research methods in their own societies both to develop their discipline and to further its application to social problems. Some of these were present at the conference. The work of such sociologists is aided by the fact that most Latin American countries have taken censuses recently, using improved techniques. In one case, however, political considerations have prevented the taking of a census in the past half century, apparently because of fear that a census would demonstrate a gross overrepresentation of rural areas in the national legislature.

In several countries institutes for sociological research have been organized since 1945, and at least one national university has broken with precedent by founding a faculty of sociology that has equal academic status with such ancient faculties as those of medicine and law. Also, a trend toward the appointment of full-time professors in sociology as well as in other university subjects seems to have become fairly well-established in a substantial number of Latin American countries. Some professors of sociology have acquired advanced degrees abroad and at home. They are beginning to employ sample surveys and other modern research techniques. As straws in the wind, it was noted at the conference that in recent weeks two newspaper advertisements in one country had listed competence in sociology, in addition to economics, as a qualification for a governmental position, and that in the same country a publicist, who was also a doctor of medicine, had discontinued both calling himself a sociologist and writing on “sociological” questions.

However, the position of what may be called “universal” sociology is by no means fully established even in those countries where its academic status has become most secure. The tradition of social philosophy remains strong, and there is intellectual, nationalistic, and religious resistance to the importation of “foreign” concepts and research methods. Further, the term “sociolo-

gist” as describing a specialist who has satisfied certain professional or academic requirements is still without acceptance; there is no core of theory, data, and technique that is recognized as unique to sociology as there is, for example, in law.

A suggestion made at the conference was that in these circumstances it would be helpful to the development of sociology in Latin America if a respected, external organization drew up a statement demonstrating that sociology is a distinct discipline with a special subject matter and methodology, and defining the qualifications of a sociologist. The organization preferably should be an international one, for if sociology is regarded as the science of social structure, its universal, rather than its local or national, character should be emphasized.

APPLICATIONS OF SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Not only are there new stirrings of interest in sociology in the universities, but also a receptivity in governmental and other circles to the possible usefulness of sociological research in guiding the direction and pace of plans for economic development. Measures aimed at economic development with which economists have been identified in the past decade have not satisfied the popular and official hopes aroused in some countries. Partly because of disillusionment and partly because of growing recognition that social adaptations must accompany economic innovations, sociologists are now being called upon for “solutions” to problems that economists have not resolved. This presents an opportunity, but a perilous one, since issues examined by sociologists may well have significant political implications and, further, their explanations rather than “solutions” may fail to satisfy newly awakened expectations. There are indications that economists in Latin America welcome the cooperation of sociologists in dealing with certain problems of social change. Also, despite opposition from some financial and political circles, there are Latin American political leaders who recognize that sociological research may be able to provide rational bases for practical measures of social amelioration. Further, in growing societies subject to rapid changes induced by economic, demographic, and other developments, the results of research by sociologists could be of unparalleled aid both in channeling social changes and in overcoming resistance to them, so as to maximize the chances for peaceful growth through democratic procedures rather than through forcible and totalitarian methods.

If Latin American sociologists were to accept the increasingly insistent requests from lawyers, physicians, educators, and officials to participate in the process of guiding their countries’ development, would not the

objectivity and scientific character of the activities of such sociologists and the training of their students be compromised? Is it necessary that, like a majority of their counterparts in the United States, they disengage themselves from efforts to improve social welfare or to promote social and economic changes?

When such questions were asked at the conference, they were answered in the negative. Participants from the United States considered that the evolution of the discipline in Latin America need not recapitulate that in the United States, where early reform-minded sociologists lost prestige because of the inadequacy of their research techniques, and where the improvement of techniques had coincided with decreasing professional concern with reform. Most of the Latin American participants appeared to regard contributing to the improvement of the people's lot in underdeveloped societies as the principal task facing the discipline of sociology. It was suggested that the chief difference between the actions of politicians and sociologists concerned with this task lay in the politicians' frequent making of policy decisions on the basis of less adequate data. The Latin American participants therefore agreed with their North American colleagues that a sociologist might properly regard himself as a professional if he were concerned both with promoting social melioration and with utilizing scientific methods of data gathering and analysis to that end. Indeed, it was thought that Latin American sociologists would find it nearly impossible to avoid becoming involved in their countries' drives toward economic and social development. At the same time, their engagement in this process meant to them that their best efforts could not be devoted wholly to improving the quality and quantity of training and research in the direction of the most rigorous standards attained elsewhere. It was clear that Latin America needs more sociologists.

DIFFICULTIES IN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION

However, as they look to sociologists in other countries for assistance in these essentially sociological tasks, two principal difficulties are encountered. The first is the parochialism of sociology even in those countries where the discipline is most advanced. Latin American universities and institutes, in trying to take advantage of the most recent work in sociology abroad, have found that many sociological propositions developed in the United States and Europe are culture-bound and are at best only partially valid in Latin America. Furthermore, examples are often based on Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles, and not Mexico City, Buenos Aires, or Rio de

Janeiro. Rural sociological studies often refer to conditions in Iowa, New York State, Louisiana, etc. Efforts are under way, therefore, to develop teaching materials in sociology that are based on research in Latin America, but at the same time to keep students informed of research elsewhere so as to avoid any tendency toward the growth of a "Latin American sociology," which would itself be an undesirable form of provincialism.

The second difficulty facing Latin American sociologists who seek aid from the experience of their colleagues elsewhere is the absence of systematic theories of social change. The existence of this problem was admitted by North American sociologists, who stated that they and their colleagues had worked for some twenty years under assumptions of social stability in the United States and that in so doing they had lost some of the helpful influences of historical perspective. They stated that existing theory of social development in the United States, applicable to both past and contemporary periods, seemed to accept the proposition that countries passed through a preindustrial stage, followed by a dynamic stage, and then entered a new, static stage, although the presumed stability of the third stage is coming to be recognized as fictitious. North American sociologists are beginning to recognize that their sociological theory in its most developed form is not applicable to societies very different from their own; and that another principal deficiency of this theory is that it does not offer adequate ways of treating problems of social change. Predictive models of probable sequences are needed that will take account of the effects of economic or political factors, so that change may be given adequate consideration as an inherent aspect of social organization. It was suggested that there is a place for a new kind of sociology associated with planning for social development as distinct from, and broader than, economic development. At one Latin American institution an attempt is under way to work out the elements of a "sociology of development" within the framework of a democratic polity.

A SOCIOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT

Illustrative of the content of a "sociology of development" are the following suggestions, which were made in discussion of research possibilities in Latin America. An attempt should be made to identify the "strategic areas" in which sociologists should work on Latin American social problems. Criteria of such areas are: (1) research should be significant for both social theory and social action; (2) investigators should choose factors or elements appropriate for action designed to increase the rate of economic growth; (3) research should test gen-

eralizations made in other societies or attack problems of interest to one or more societies.

The following areas were specifically mentioned as strategic: Research on rural life and society would be significant to the extent that land reform is becoming recognized as a prerequisite for economic growth. Research is desirable on entrepreneurs—their ideologies and capacities for innovation. It is important to know more about the political process. How are the democratic or other political systems really operating in Latin America? What is the nature of educational systems not only in structural terms, but also in relation to such questions as their contributions to social mobility? More broadly, research is needed on social structure and stratification, with special reference to the emergence of new social classes and new structures of power.

From the conference discussions there emerged some notions about comparative studies in sociology. It is possible to speak of a "universal" sociology in terms of the diffusion of advanced research techniques, but not in terms of substantive propositions, for many of these have been derived from research only in the United States and Western Europe. Conscious and intensive economic development creates new conditions of social change. Sociologists in Latin America, therefore, who look for insight and knowledge from the experience of their North American colleagues have been able to find and exploit rich sources of research technology, but relatively meager founts of wisdom. These sociologists are relatively few in number, but they are intensely desirous of making contributions both to their disci-

pline and to the advancement of their societies. One of the immediate results of the conference was the formation by Latin American participants of a new organization, the Latin American Group for the Development of Sociology.

Research on social development, it was suggested at the conference, may become an attractive field for sociologists in the United States. It provides an opportunity for both re-examination of some basic assumptions and their testing through field study in Latin America and elsewhere. The growth of such interests might be enhanced by the initiation of various types of aid to scholarly communication, ranging through conferences, programs of fellowships and grants, measures to increase the availability of research materials, and research collaboration. As a start in this direction, a specific proposal was made at the conference that a three-day conference of about 25 sociologists from Latin America and the United States be held following the meeting of the International Sociological Association in September 1962, for consideration of formal papers on cross-national comparative studies.

The conference demonstrated that, with a common language in a common methodology and the acceptance of the validity of objective studies of society, sociologists from different cultures possess strong mutual interests that offer promise for productive research in the future. It taught all of us, however, that sociology and other social sciences must, if they are to claim universality, consider the differences of the historical and cultural traditions in which they work.

RESEARCH ON THE ECONOMY OF CHINA:

FORD FOUNDATION GRANT TO THE COUNCIL

THE Council has received from the Ford Foundation a grant of \$910,000 for support for five years of a program of research on the economy of contemporary China. This program will include the preparation of a series of research monographs under the direction of Walter Galenson of the University of California, Berkeley. The program will be administered by a new Council Committee on the Economy of China, of which Simon Kuznets of Harvard University will serve as chairman. In addition to the chairman and the director of research, Abram Bergson of Harvard University, Joseph A. Kershaw of the RAND Corporation, and A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University have been appointed to the committee.

The plans for the program which has been made possible by the Ford Foundation had their origin in a conference of economists held in New York on September 9-10, 1960, under the auspices of the Joint Committee

on Contemporary China, which is maintained with the American Council of Learned Societies. The conference was chaired by Mr. Galenson and attended by some 15 economists familiar with the state of economic research and training for research on China. The conference concluded that there was urgent need for a committee that would be responsible for organizing and conducting a coordinated series of research projects. Exploration of the possibilities for developing such a program was arranged by the joint committee and carried out by Mr. Galenson and Alexander Eckstein of its membership, with the participation of Messrs. Kuznets, Bergson, Choh-ming Li of the University of California, Berkeley, and Ta-chung Liu of Cornell University. On the basis of the surveys of research personnel and materials made by this group, and its outline of needed and feasible research, the Council requested funds for the program.

THE ALUMNI OF THE COUNCIL'S UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

by Elbridge Sibley

A RECENT canvass of the recipients of undergraduate research stipends from the Council in the years 1953-56 has revealed that a majority of them went on to graduate study in the social sciences and about two fifths either have acquired, or are still actively pursuing, the doctoral degree in a social science field. These facts by themselves suggest that the Council's unique program for undergraduates was probably fruitful; further analysis of the participants' reports of their subsequent education, current activities, and career aims leads to some more specific reflections on the results of the experiment.

The undergraduate research training program was initiated in 1953 and supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation for a trial period of four years. Two objectives were in view: to attract to careers in the social sciences bright students who might otherwise enter other vocations, and to accelerate the maturation of potential social scientists. College teachers throughout the country were invited to nominate as candidates for undergraduate research stipends students in their junior year whom they considered to have superior aptitude for social science. While it was hoped to attract students who had not yet committed themselves to becoming social scientists, those who had already made such a commitment were not excluded. Each student receiving a stipend of \$600 was to devote the summer before his senior year to research under the personal supervision of a faculty member, and to write a report of his research during the ensuing academic year. The faculty supervisor received an honorarium if he was obliged to forego other work in order to guide the student's research during the summer. Undergraduates receiving stipends were eligible to compete for first-year graduate study fellowships, offered by the Council as a part of the program, if they decided to begin graduate study in a social science immediately after graduation from college.

During the four years 1953-56 a total of 812 college students were nominated, and 210 of these received awards.¹ Two thirds—152—of these undergraduates applied for the first-year graduate study fellowships, of which 90 were offered and 75 actually were held. The following statistics (Tables 1-4) embody information given by 180, or 86 percent, of the 210 alumni of the program in response to an inquiry made by mail last winter.

¹ The recipients are listed in the Council's *Annual Reports* for the years 1952-53, 1953-54, 1954-55, and 1955-56, on pages 56-59, 76-80, 59-63, and 70-75, respectively.

TABLE 1. FIELDS OF GRADUATE STUDY

	Number	Percent
Recipients of undergraduate awards	210	100.0
Reporting graduate study	168	80.0
Psychology	30	
Sociology	25	
Anthropology	18	
History	18	
Economics	11	
Political science	10	
Other social sciences	2	
Total, social sciences	114	54.2
Other academic fields	8	3.8
Law	15	7.1
Medicine	8	3.8
Clinical psychology	8	3.8
Other vocational fields	15	7.1
No graduate study	10	4.8
No information given	32	15.2

TABLE 2. SUBSEQUENT EDUCATION: ADVANCED DEGREES IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, 1960-61

	Number	Percent
Total undergraduate recipients	210	100.0
Ph.D. degree received	27	12.9
Currently working for Ph.D. degree	54	25.7
M.A. or M.S. degree received *	15	7.1
No advanced degree in social science	79	37.6
No information given	35	16.7

* Presumably terminal.

TABLE 3. OCCUPATION IN 1960-61

	Number	Percent
Total undergraduate recipients	210	100.0
Graduate or postdoctoral study in social sciences	47	22.4
Teaching social sciences	34	16.2
Employed or studying in other fields	71	33.8
Housewives	23	11.0
Unemployed or deceased	5	2.4
No information given	30	14.3

TABLE 4. VOCATIONAL GOALS EXPRESSED IN 1960-61

	Number	Percent
Total undergraduate recipients	210	100.0
Social sciences	77	36.7
Other academic fields	10	4.8
Law	14	6.7
Medicine	7	3.3
Clinical psychology	9	4.3
Business	3	1.4
Social work	3	1.4
Other fields	18	8.6
Goal not specified	69	32.9

WOMEN VS. MEN

Slightly more than a third, 74, of the 210 recipients of undergraduate awards were young women. Comparison of their subsequent careers with those of the young men justifies the prevalent view that women are statistically "poorer risks" with respect to productive scholarship. Although nearly as large a percentage of the women pursued some graduate study in social science, the proportions taking higher degrees and aiming to make careers in the social sciences are conspicuously lower than those of men (Table 5).

TABLE 5. GRADUATE STUDY, DOCTORAL DEGREES, AND CAREERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, BY SEX, 1960-61

	Percent of men *	Percent of women *
Some graduate study in social sciences	66	60
Reporting vocational goal in social sciences	55	30
Currently working for Ph.D. degree	36	21
Ph.D. degree received	20	7
Currently teaching social sciences	26	6

* Percentages are based on numbers of cases for which information is available for the respective items. Columns are not cumulative.

SECOND STAGE OF SELECTION

In making selections among college juniors, the administrative committee had to rely largely on the evidence contained in transcripts of their grades, and on the testimony of their sponsors. Each candidate for an undergraduate stipend, to be sure, was required to submit a prospectus of his research project for the summer, but it was often difficult to judge to what extent the plan represented the student's thinking or his teacher's. In the following year, two further selective processes were operative. The students themselves first had to decide whether to enter the competition for graduate fellowships, and the committee then appraised those who applied as candidates. At this stage the committee in most cases was able to gain some impression of the student's performance in research during the preceding months. The results of these selections by the students and by the committee are reflected in Table 6.

The figures in Table 6 almost speak for themselves, indicating that the nonapplicants shown in the last column had largely eliminated themselves from consideration because they were destined for other vocations; whereas comparison of the first two columns shows that the committee was fairly successful in identifying those applicants who were most likely to achieve advanced degrees and to make their careers in social sciences.

APPRAISAL

Although final assessment of the outcome of the Council's experiment in undergraduate research training

TABLE 6. GRADUATE STUDY, ADVANCED DEGREES, AND CAREERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, 1960-61, OF RECIPIENTS, NONRECIPIENTS, AND NONAPPLICANTS FOR FIRST-YEAR GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS *

	Percent of		
	78 Fellows	53 Rejected applicants	47 Nonapplicants
Some graduate study in social sciences	87	64	26
Currently working for Ph.D. degree in social sciences	51	23	4
Ph.D. degree received in social sciences	23	13	4
Currently teaching social sciences	24	26	2
Some graduate study in other fields	13**	32	57
No graduate study	0	4	17

* Percentages in this table are based on numbers of cases for which information is available. Columns are not cumulative.

** Some of these began graduate study in tangential fields, though avowing intent ultimately to make their careers in social sciences; others resigned the fellowship to enter other fields.

must be deferred some years longer, it is not too soon to conclude, on the basis both of the statistics just presented and of the comments received from the students and their teachers, that the program was successful to a gratifying degree. It appears to have served very well one of its objectives, that of reinforcing tentative commitments of students to social science careers and hastening their maturation by giving them an opportunity relatively early to become really immersed in the process of research. Robert Wilson, who as a member of the Council's staff during 1953-56 was largely responsible for administration of the program, has described the typical development of a student's motivation from an undisciplined urge to understand and serve humanity to a disciplined interest in scientific research.² Faculty sponsors of undergraduate participants in the program have commented that their eyes were opened to the ability of bright college students to meet real intellectual challenges in the social sciences if given opportunity and encouragement. Whereas it cannot be asserted that many students who already seriously intended to follow other vocations were induced by their experience in the program to shift to careers in the social sciences, it does appear that many who had not made their career choices when they entered it emerged with a firm determination to become social scientists. Impossible to measure, but potentially important, is the indirect influence the program may have had on various campuses by demonstrating to other students and teachers that social science can be an exciting field for undergraduates if they take it seriously.

² Robert N. Wilson, "The Undergraduate Social Scientist," *Items*, September 1954, pp. 25-29.

Perhaps most important of all was the creation of a situation in which both the student and his teacher were led to assess at early stages his aptitude for a career in social science. There have been numerous expressions of regret, both from participants and from others, that the program had to be terminated when the initial funds were exhausted after a few years. Subsequently, however, numerous colleges have introduced in their own cur-

ricula more opportunities for actual research by their own students, and the National Science Foundation has instituted a similar program of grants for undergraduate research participation, which may have a significant influence on the character of undergraduate training in the social sciences if college teachers in these fields become sufficiently active in encouraging their students to take part.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

CONTEMPORARY CHINA: SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH ON CHINESE SOCIETY

John C. Pelzel (chairman), Morton H. Fried, G. William Skinner; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

The Joint Committee on Contemporary China, which is co-sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, has held disciplinary conferences in the fields of economics, geography, and sociology and anthropology during the past year to explore means of advancing training and research on contemporary China in these disciplines. The conference on research in sociology and anthropology was held on September 25, 1961 at the office of the Council. It was attended by Maurice Freedman, London School of Economics; Morton H. Fried, Columbia University; Marion J. Levy, Jr., Princeton University; John M. H. Lindbeck, Harvard University, representing the joint committee; Robert M. Marsh, Cornell University; John C. Pelzel, Harvard University; G. William Skinner, Cornell University; Irene B. Taeuber, Princeton University; Ezra F. Vogel, Harvard University; and C. K. Yang, University of Pittsburgh. In the view of the participants in the conference, research on China by sociologists and anthropologists could be aided best at the present time through facilitating more effective communication among scholars in these disciplines who are interested in such research. To this end, it was proposed that a series of seminars be held in 1962 and 1963 on methods and substantive areas of research on Chinese society. This proposal was approved by the SSRC's Committee on Problems and Policy in September, and the present subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Contemporary China was appointed to make plans for the seminars. The main concern of the subcommittee is with contemporary China, but it is also interested in stimulating promising research on the traditional society, and on relevant aspects of the non-Han peoples of China, the overseas Chinese, and the population of Taiwan. Support for the seminars has been provided through a grant to the Council from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The subcommittee in its first three meetings, held on October 16, October 30, and December 1, developed plans for seminars on methodological problems of documentary and

field research on Chinese society, and invited Robert Marsh to correspond with scholars in the United States and abroad in order to extend the subcommittee's knowledge of individuals whose research interests are relevant to its program.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Bert F. Hoselitz, Wilbert E. Moore, Neil J. Smelser, Joseph J. Spengler.

A conference on indigenous and induced elements in the economies of Sub-Saharan Africa was held by the committee at Northwestern University on November 16-18 with the collaboration of the University's Program of African Studies. On the basis of papers prepared and circulated in advance, the conference discussed in considerable detail the extent of existing knowledge regarding the economic systems of the new African states and regarding factors that may facilitate or impede their economic development. The some 30 participants and guests consisted mainly of anthropologists and economists, and consequently parts of the discussion were directed toward ways of interrelating the findings and future research efforts in these disciplines with respect to African problems. The papers prepared for the session of the conference on indigenous patterns were "Economics in East African Aboriginal Societies," by Harold K. Schneider, Lawrence College; "West African Economic Systems," by Elliott P. Skinner, New York University; "Land Holding and Social Organization," by Daniel Biebuyck, University of Delaware; and "Social Stratification and Economic Differentials," by Lloyd A. Fallers, University of Chicago.

For two sessions on induced phenomena of contact the papers were "Land Use, Land Tenure and Land Reform," by Paul J. Bohannon, Northwestern University; "Changes in Agricultural Productivity and Patterns of Production in Tropical Africa," by Bruce F. Johnston, Stanford University; "The Small Entrepreneur as a Factor in Inducing Change and in Capital Formation in British African Territories," by Margaret Katzin, Northwestern University; "The Evolution of African Living Standards," by Elliot J.

Berg, Harvard University; "Demographic Factors in Economic Development in Tropical Africa South of the Sahara," by H. W. Singer, United Nations; "The Development of the Economic Infrastructure," by A. M. Kamarck, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; "African Labor Systems and Their Adaptation to Social Change," by Wilbert E. Moore, Princeton University; and "Trade, Pecuniary Innovations, and the Movement into the World Economy," by William J. Barber, Wesleyan University.

For the session on present and future problems of economic growth the papers were "Economic Growth as a Problem for Newly Independent Nations," by Pius Okigbo, Ministry of Economic Planning, Enugu, Nigeria; "Trends in African Exports and Capital Inflows," by Walter A. Chudsen, United Nations; "Capital and Trade Flows in Newly Independent Countries: West Africa," by Jo W. Saxe, Harvard University; "International Organizations and African Economic Growth," by Lattee A. Fahm, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and "Internal Political Reorientation and Economic Growth," by James S. Coleman, University of California, Los Angeles.

A summary paper by Mr. Herskovits, "Africa and the Problem of Economic Growth," was presented at the final session. The conference papers are to be revised by their authors with the expectation that they will appear in a volume to be edited by Mr. Herskovits and Mitchell Harwitz of the Department of Economics, Northwestern University.

INTELLECTIVE PROCESSES RESEARCH

William Kessen (chairman), Roger Brown, Jerome Kagan, Lloyd N. Morrisett, Paul H. Mussen, A. Kimball Romney, Harold W. Stevenson; *staff*, Francis H. Palmer.

The committee held the third in its series of conferences on research on the development of cognitive processes on October 27-29, at Endicott House, Dedham, Massachusetts. The topic of the conference was First-Language Acquisition, and the program included papers on the following subjects: "The Development of Grammar in Child Language," by Wick Miller and Susan Ervin, University of California, Berkeley, discussed by Noam Chomsky, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; "Evaluation Procedures for Grammars Written for the Speech of Children," by Roger Brown, Colin Fraser, and Ursula Bellugi, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and "The Acquisition of Syntax," by Brown and Fraser, both discussed by Robert Lees, University of Illinois; "Development from Vocal to Verbal Behavior in Children," by Margaret Bullowa, Massachusetts Mental Health Center, and Lawrence G. Jones, Boston College, discussed by Dell Hymes, University of California, Berkeley; "Speech as a Motor Skill with Special Reference to Nonaphasic Disorders," by Eric H. Lenneberg, Harvard University, discussed by Hans-Leukas Teuber, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; "Mediation Processes and the Acquisition of

Linguistic Structure," by James J. Jenkins and David S. Palermo, University of Minnesota, discussed by Mr. Kagan. General comments on the papers and discussions were offered by James Deese, Johns Hopkins University, and O. K. Moore, Yale University. In addition to members of the committee and other authors of papers, Jean B. Gleason of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Morris Halle of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and William Livant of the University of Michigan attended the conference.

NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

(Joint with American Council of Learned Societies)

T. Cuyler Young (chairman), Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Majid Khadduri, Dankwart A. Rustow, William D. Schorger, Wilfred C. Smith, Gustave E. von Grunebaum, John A. Wilson; *staff*, Rowland L. Mitchell, Jr.

Under the sponsorship of the joint committee a conference of specialists on the Near and Middle East was held in New York on October 20-22. The participants, in addition to the members and staff of the committee, were: Willard A. Beling, University of Southern California; Robert N. Bellah, Harvard University; Leonard Binder and Marshall G. S. Hodgson, University of Chicago; Carleton S. Coon, University of Pennsylvania; Roderic H. Davison, George Washington University; C. Ernest Dawn, University of Illinois; Richard Ettinghausen, Freer Gallery of Art; Oleg Grabar and George F. Hourani, University of Michigan; Manfred Halpern, Frederic Shorter, and Lewis V. Thomas, Princeton University; Pendleton Herring; J. C. Hurewitz and Joseph Schacht, Columbia University; George Lenczowski, University of California, Berkeley; Herbert J. Liebesny and William R. Polk, Department of State; Richard Nolte, Institute of Current World Affairs; Franz Rosenthal, Yale University; William Sands, *Middle East Journal*; Cleon Swayzee, Ford Foundation; Gordon B. Turner, American Council of Learned Societies. Three papers on research on the contemporary Near East were circulated in advance and discussed as indicated: "The Self-Image of Islamic Culture," by Mr. Gibb, discussed by Messrs. Rosenthal and von Grunebaum; "The Social Community in the Contemporary Near East," by Mr. Schorger, discussed by Messrs. Bellah and Coon; "The Political Community in the Contemporary Near East," by Mr. Binder, discussed by Messrs. Hurewitz and Lenczowski. In addition, two sessions were devoted to discussion of professional concerns. At the concluding session the conference named a Cooperating Committee on the Development and Organization of Near Eastern Studies, which is to be independent of the joint committee but to work closely with it in considering possibilities for promoting better communication among scholars working on the Near and Middle East. Messrs. Schorger (chairman), Grabar, Halpern, Hurewitz, Thomas, and von Grunebaum are the members of this committee.

PERSONNEL

The members of the Joint Committee on Asian Studies, which is sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies, for the year 1961-62 are John A. Pope, Freer Gallery of Art (chairman); Robert I. Crane, Duke University; William T. de Bary, Columbia University; Paul S. Dull, University of Oregon; John L. Landgraf, New York University; and Rodger Swearingen, University of Southern California.

Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education, has been named chairman of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils for 1961-62. M. H. Trytten of the National Research Council is vice-chairman. Douglas M. Knight, President of Lawrence College, has been designated by the ACE as a member of the Conference Board.

A new Committee on Exchanges with Asian Institutions has been appointed by the SSRC to select American social scientists to participate in the development of research at the Oriental Library (Toyo Bunko), Tokyo, and the National Central Research Institution (Academia Sinica),

Taipei, with funds made available by the Ford Foundation. The members are John K. Fairbank, Harvard University (chairman); George E. Taylor, University of Washington; C. Martin Wilbur, Columbia University; and Mary C. Wright, Yale University.

Holland Hunter of Haverford College has been appointed a member of the Committee on Grants-in-Aid, succeeding James M. Buchanan (resigned).

Stanley J. Stein of Princeton University has been appointed a member of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, succeeding Irving A. Leonard (resigned).

Robert C. Wood of Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been appointed a member of the Committee on National Security Policy Research.

Nicholas Hobbs of George Peabody College for Teachers has been appointed to the Committee on Personality Development in Youth.

Alex Inkeles of Harvard University has been appointed to the Committee on Socialization and Social Structure.

CONTENTS OF ITEMS, VOLUMES 12-15 (1958-61)

ARTICLES

- Administration of the Law of Torts: A Fourth Summer Research Training Institute on Interrelations of the Law and Other Social Institutions to be Held in 1961*, 14:32
- Brinegar, George K., Kenneth L. Bachman, and Herman M. Southworth. *Reorientations in Research in Agricultural Economics*, 13:1
- Eggan, Fred. *The Ninth Pacific Science Congress*, 12:13
- Evans, G. Heberton, Jr. "Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957," 14:16
- Feldman, Arnold S., and Wilbert E. Moore. *Moot Points in the Theory of Labor Commitment in Developing Areas*, 14:37
- Gordon, R. A. *Research on Economic Stability*, 13:37
- Gottschalk, Louis. *Report on the Work of the Council's Committee on Historical Analysis*, 12:25
- Grants for Latin American Studies: A New Program of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies*, 13:31
- Grants for Research on American Governmental and Legal Processes: Expansion of the Program of the Committee on Political Behavior*, 13:32
- Grants for Research on National Security Policy with Particular Emphasis on Economic Problems: A Third Program of the Council's Committee*, 13:4
- Hauser, Philip M. *Report on the Work of the Committee on Urbanization*, 13:40
- Herring, Pendleton. *On Science and the Polity*, 15 (Part 2):1
- Hoover, Edgar M. *The Conference on Natural Resources and Economic Growth*, 14:13
- Kalven, Harry, Jr., and Bryce Wood. *Research in the Field of Torts*, 14:42

* An index to the contents of *Items*, Vols. 1-2 (1947-48) was published in Vol. 3, No. 1 (March 1949), pp. 11-12; to Vols. 3-8 (1949-54) in Vol. 8, No. 4 (December 1954), pp. 49-51; and to Vols. 9-11 (1955-57) in Vol. 11, No. 4 (December 1957), pp. 54-55.

- Kessen, William. *Intellective Development in Children: A Conference on Piaget's Contributions in Relation to Other Theories of Children's Thinking*, 14:25
- Kirk, Dudley. *Population Census Monographs: Objectives and Plans of the Committee*, 14:31
- Klein, Lawrence R. *The Dartmouth Conference on an Economic Model of the United States*, 15:34
- Kuznets, Simon. *Notes on the Study of Economic Growth*, 13:13
- LaPalombara, Joseph. *The Comparative Roles of Groups in Political Systems*, 15:18
- Marquis, Donald G. *College Influences on Personality Development: Report of a Research Planning Conference*, 12:27
- Merton, Robert K. *The History of Quantification in the Sciences: Report on a Conference*, 14:1
- Moore, Wilbert E. *A Note on the Measurement of Social Change*, 12:42
- Morrisett, Lloyd, Jr. *Research on College Influences on Personality: Report on the Andover Conference, March 26-28, 1959*, 13:28
- Palmer, Francis H. *Critical Periods of Development: Report on a Conference*, 15:13
- Pye, Lucian W. *Political Modernization and Research on the Process of Political Socialization*, 13:25
- Research on the Economy of China: Ford Foundation Grant to the Council*, 15:45
- Research on Personality Development in Youth: Program of a New Council Committee*, 12:5
- Restructuring of the Council's General Fellowship and Grant Programs*, 13:33
- Sibley, Elbridge. *The Alumni of the Council's Undergraduate Research Training Program*, 15:46
- Simon, Herbert A. *Training for Research on Organizations: A Report on the Summer Institute, 1957*, 12:1
- Simon, Herbert A., and Allen Newell. *Simulation of Cog-*

native Processes: A Report on the Summer Research Training Institute, 1958, 12:37

Smith, M. Brewster. *Report on the Work of the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, 12:40*

Truman, David B. *Theory and Research on Metropolitan Political Leadership: Report on a Conference, 15:1*

Tyler, Ralph W. *The Committee on Personality Development in Youth, 15:32*

Weiler, E. T. *An Appraisal of the Summer Research Training Institute on Monetary and Credit Policy, 1957, 12:4*

Wood, Bryce, and Charles Wagley. *The Social Sciences: Parochial or Cosmopolitan? Reflections on the Inter-American Conference on Research and Training in Sociology, 15:41*

Young, Francis A. *The Fulbright Program in Asia, 15:29*

COMMITTEE BRIEFS AND OTHER REPORTS

African Studies, 14:24; 15:8

Agricultural Economics, 12:6; 13:1, 43; 14:44; 15:21

Analysis of Economic Census Data, 12:16, 30; 13:5, 43; 15:37

Asian Studies, 13:23; 14:8; 15:26

Auxiliary Research Awards, 12:24; 13:10; 15:40

Comparative Developmental Behavior, 15:13

Comparative Politics, 12:9, 30; 13:17, 25; 14:33; 15:18, 37

Contemporary China, 13:44; 14:24, 34, 44; 15:8, 21, 48

Cross-Cultural Education, 12:40

Economic Growth, 12:6, 31, 43; 13:13, 44; 14:13, 37, 45; 15:4, 48

Economic Stability, 13:37; 15:4, 34

Faculty Research Fellowships, 12:17; 13:18; 14:6, 21; 15:6, 24

Family and Economic Behavior, 12:31; 13:5

Grants-in-Aid, 12:20; 13:7, 21; 14:6, 21; 15:6, 25

Grants for Research on Governmental Affairs, 12:8; 13:8; 14:22; 15:26

Historical Analysis, 12:25

Historical Statistics, 12:7; 13:6, 34; 14:16

History of Science, 13:34, 44; 14:1

Intellective Processes Research, 13:44; 14:25; 15:22, 49

International Conference Travel Grants, 12:9, 23; 13:10; 14:9; 15:10, 27

International Exchange of Persons, 13:6; 15:29

Latin American Studies, 13:31; 14:23; 15:8, 37, 41

Linguistics and Psychology, 12:7, 31; 13:17; 14:18; 15:22

Mathematics in Social Science Research, 12:32, 44; 13:18, 35; 15:37, 52

National Security Policy Research, 12:8, 22; 13:4, 44; 14:7; 15:7, 26

Near and Middle East, 12:8; 13:9, 45; 14:8; 15:9, 27, 49

Personality Development in Youth, 12:5, 27, 44; 13:18, 28; 15:5, 32

Political Behavior, 12:9, 21; 13:8, 23, 32; 14:5, 7, 23, 32, 42; 15:1, 7, 10

Political Theory and Legal Philosophy Fellowships, 12:19; 13:21; 14:22; 15:26

Population Census Monographs, 13:45; 14:31; 15:5

Preservation and Use of Economic Data, 15:38

Preventive Medicine and Social Science Research, 12:32

Research Training, 12:1, 4, 10, 44

Simulation of Cognitive Processes, 12:11, 37; 13:18; 14:5

Slavic and East European Grants, 14:45; 15:9

Slavic Studies, 12:16, 22, 33; 13:7, 9, 35, 46; 14:7, 18

Social Science Personnel, 12:17, 22; 13:18, 23; 14:19; 15:22

Socialization and Social Structure, 15:5

Urbanization, 12:45; 13:40

PERSONNEL APPOINTMENTS

Auxiliary Research Awards, 13:10

Committees, 12:11, 45; 13:11, 47; 14:34, 46, 47; 15:38, 50

Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 14:47

Directors of the Council, 12:8, 45; 13:7, 46; 14:5, 45; 15:5, 38

Faculty Research Fellowships, 12:17; 13:18; 14:6, 21; 15:6, 24

Faculty Research Grants, 12:20; 13:8, 22

Grants for African Studies, 15:8

Grants-in-Aid, 12:20; 13:7, 21; 14:6, 21; 15:6, 25

Grants for Asian Studies, 13:23; 14:8; 15:26

Grants for Field Studies of Political Groups, 12:9

Grants for Latin American Studies, 14:23; 15:8

Grants for Research on American Governmental Processes, 12:9, 21; 13:8, 23; and Legal Processes, 14:7; 15:7

Grants for Research on Contemporary China, 15:8

Grants for Research on National Defense Problems, 12:22; on National Security Policy, 14:7; 15:7, 26

Grants for Research on the Near and Middle East, 12:8; 13:9; 14:8; 15:9, 27

Grants for Research on State Politics, 12:21

Grants for Slavic and East European Studies, 12:22; 13:9; 14:7; 15:9

International Conference Travel Grants, 12:9, 23; 13:10; 14:9; 15:10, 27

Officers and Staff of the Council, 12:33, 45; 13:46; 14:23, 35, 45; 15:38

Political Theory and Legal Philosophy Fellowships, 12:19; 13:21; 14:22; 15:26

Research Training Fellowships, 12:17; 13:18; 14:19; 15:22

Senior Awards for Research on Governmental Affairs, 12:8; 13:8; 14:22; 15:26

Summer Grants for Field Training in Social Anthropology, 12:22; 13:23

Summer Research Training Institutes, 12:10, 11; 14:23; 15:10

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Auxiliary Research Awards, 12:24; 15:40

Faculty Research Grants, 12:24; 13:36

Fellowships and Grants, 12:35; 13:33, 36, 48; 14:36, 48; 15:39

Fulbright Grants, 12:12; 15:12, 28

Grants-in-Aid, 12:24

Grants for Asian Studies, 13:12

Grants for Latin American Studies, 13:31

Grants for Research on Africa, 14:24

Grants for Research on American Governmental and Legal Processes, 13:32

Grants for Research on Contemporary China, 14:24

Grants for Research on National Security Policy, 13:4; 15:40

International Conference Travel Grants, 13:12

International Congresses in the United States, 12:36

New Council Offices, 12:33

Research on the Economy of China, 15:45

Slavic and East European Studies Travel Grants for International Conferences, 12:12

Summer Grants for Field Training in Social Anthropology, 12:12, 48

Summer Research Training Institutes, 14:32; 15:52

PUBLICATIONS

Books, 12:35, 47; 13:48; 14:12, 35, 47; 15:12, 28

Census Monographs, 12:11, 24, 34, 47; 13:11, 24, 35

Council Series, 12:24, 34, 46; 13:12, 24, 35, 48; 14:11, 35, 47; 15:11, 27

Cross-Cultural Education Monographs, 12:34, 47; 14:12, 35, 48; 15:12, 28

SUMMER INSTITUTES ON MATHEMATICAL MODELS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH TO BE HELD IN 1962

APPLICATIONS for admission to four six-week summer institutes for advanced graduate students and recent recipients of the Ph.D. in social sciences, to be held June 18 - July 27, 1962 at Stanford University and Princeton University, under the auspices of the Council's Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research, will be accepted through February 15, 1962. The institutes will be concerned with the construction and use of mathematical models in the four fields indicated below. Minimal mathematical prerequisites for the participants are calculus and elementary probability theory, matrix algebra, sets and relations; competence in certain additional areas of mathematics may be required for particular institutes.

Enrollment in each institute will be limited to 12 participants. Each participant will be selected for his potential competence in research in the field covered by the particular institute. The participants will devote their full time to the work of the institute during the six-week period, and will receive stipends from the Council to meet in part the cost of attendance. No tuition fees will be charged.

Descriptive circulars and application forms will be furnished on request addressed to the Social Science Research Council, Committee on Mathematics in Social Science Research, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICAL LEARNING THEORY TO TWO-PERSON INTERACTIONS

Place: Stanford University Director: Cletus J. Burke

The program will include study, laboratory work, and reports on the following topics: relations between learning experiments and two-person interactions; a survey of the mathematical models that have been applied to two-person interactions; mathematical comparison of two main classes of models; evaluation of the two classes of models in terms of experimental data; the fitting of models to data, including techniques of parameter estimation; and the design of experiments on two-person interactions with special reference to experiments that provide tests of mathematical models.

PSYCHOLOGY OF CHOICE AND DECISION

Place: Stanford University Director: Frank Restle

The institute will consider theories of choice, defined in a preliminary way as the process that summarizes the factors influencing a response and relates them to the probability of response. The participants will examine the relative merits of different types of theories of choice: optimization models (game theory, statistical decision theory, and signal detectability); response laws (discriminal process and oscillation theories, Luce's Axiom, and possibly Bayesian estimation); and hypothetical mechanisms

(random walks, stimulus-scanning theories, and processes for the resolution of conflict). One problem will be to relate theories of different types—for example, to determine what random walks would satisfy the criteria in statistical decision theory, or to determine what if anything would be optimized by using Luce's Axiom—and to fill in unexplored gaps. The implications of theories of choice for the theory and techniques of psychological measurement will also be examined.

MODELS OF SOCIAL DECISION-MAKING MECHANISMS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE AND WELFARE ECONOMICS

Place: Princeton University Director: John C. Harsanyi

The topics to be considered include: (1) Individual rational choice under certainty, risk, and uncertainty, as well as in cooperative and noncooperative game situations; ordinal and cardinal utility measures; irrationality; limited rationality. (2) Social welfare and social rationality; the problem of interpersonal comparisons of utility; the consumers' sovereignty doctrine and its limitations; welfare economics and the major economic policy problems of modern societies. (3) Social decision-making mechanisms; the market; bargaining; majority vote; government decree; centralization and decentralization; capitalism, socialism, mixed economies; efficiency of alternative social decision-making mechanisms. (4) Social power; its measurement in two-person and in n-person situations; independent power and incentive power; applications to social decision-making mechanisms. (5) General conclusions and open problems. The time devoted to each topic will depend on the interests of the participants. Each participant will be expected to discuss his own relevant research.

BARGAINING, NEGOTIATION, AND CONFLICT

Place: Princeton University Director: Harold W. Kuhn

Topics will be selected from the following: (1) The bargaining problem: pre- and postgame theoretical approaches; Edgeworth's treatment of bilateral monopoly; theories of Zeuthen and Hicks; Raiffa's theory of arbitration; game theory work of Nash and Harsanyi. (2) Problems of fair division: theories of Knaster and Steinhaus; extensions and contributions of Guilband; fair division of indivisible objects; Vickrey's theory of auctions. (3) Models of negotiation: formulation and development of models of negotiation; synthesis of institutional, psychological, and economic elements. (4) Applications: labor-management and international negotiation. The division of time will depend on the interests and backgrounds of the participants.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1961: GARDNER ACKLEY, PAUL J. BOHANNAN, JOHN A. CLAUSEN, HAROLD F. DORN, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, CHAUNCEY D. HARRIS, H. FIELD HAVILAND, JR., PENDLETON HERRING, GEORGE H. HILDEBRAND, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, NATHAN KEYFITZ, LYLE H. LANIER, AVERY LEISERSON, EDWARD H. LEVI, PHILIP J. MCCARTHY, WILBERT E. MOORE, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, J. ROLAND PENNOCK, DAVID M. POTTER, NEVITT SANFORD, HERBERT A. SIMON, MELFORD E. SPIRO, DAVID B. TRUMAN, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG, T. CUYLER YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIDLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD, ELEANOR C. ISBELL, FRANCIS H. PALMER, ROWLAND L. MITCHELL, JR., *Staff Associates*; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*

